

TAME AUTOMORPHISMS OF $\mathbb{C}^3$ WITH MULTIDEGREE OF THE FORM $(3, d_2, d_3)$

MAREK KARASÍ

ABSTRACT. In this note we prove that the sequence $(3, d_2, d_3)$, where $d_3 \geq d_2 \geq 3$, is the multidegree of some tame automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^3$ if and only if $3|d_2$ or $d_3 \in 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

By multidegree of a polynomial mapping $F = (F_1, \dots, F_n) : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, denoted $\text{mdeg } F$, we call the sequence $(\deg F_1, \dots, \deg F_n)$. It seems to be interesting for which sequences $(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ there are automorphisms or tame automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with $\text{mdeg } F = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$. Let us recall that a tame automorphism is a composition of linear and triangular automorphisms.

By $\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ we will denote the group of all tame automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and by mdeg the mapping from the set of all endomorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^n$ into the set $\mathbb{N}^n$.

In [3] was proven that $(3, 4, 5), (3, 5, 7), (4, 5, 7), (4, 5, 11) \notin \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3))$ and that for all $d_3 \geq d_2 \geq 2$, $(2, d_2, d_3) \in \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3))$. Next in [4] it was proven that if $d_3 \geq d_2 > d_1 > 2$, and d_1, d_2 are prime numbers, then $(d_1, d_2, d_3) \in \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3))$ if and only if $d_3 \in d_1\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$. In this paper we investigate the set

$$\{(3, d_2, d_3) \mid 3 \leq d_2 \leq d_3\} \cap \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3)).$$

Namely we show the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *If $3 \leq d_2 \leq d_3$, then $(3, d_2, d_3) \in \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3))$ if and only if $3|d_2$ or $d_3 \in 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$.*

Since for all permutation σ of the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$, $(d_1, d_2, d_3) \in \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3))$ if and only if $(d_{\sigma(1)}, d_{\sigma(2)}, d_{\sigma(3)}) \in \text{mdeg}(\text{Tame}(\mathbb{C}^3))$, then the assumption $3 \leq d_2 \leq d_3$ is not restrictive.

2. SOME USEFUL RESULTS

For the convenient of the reader we collect in this section all results that we will need in the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *If a, b are positive integers such that $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, then for every integer $k \geq (a-1)(b-1)$ there are $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$k = k_1a + k_2b.$$

Moreover $(a-1)(b-1) - 1 \notin a\mathbb{N} + b\mathbb{N}$.

In the proof we will, also, use the following proposition.

Key words and phrases. polynomial automorphism, tame automorphism, multidegree.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 14Rxx, 14R10.

Proposition 3. ([3], Proposition 2.2) *If for a sequence of integers $1 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ there is $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that*

$$d_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} k_j d_j \quad \text{with } k_j \in \mathbb{N},$$

then there exists a tame automorphism F of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with $\text{mdeg } F = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$.

Definition 1. ([6], Definition 1) *A pair $f, g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is called $*$ -reduced if*
 (i) f, g are algebraically independent;
 (ii) $\bar{f}, \bar{g}$ are algebraically dependent, where $\bar{h}$ denotes the highest homogeneous part of h ;
 (iii) $\bar{f} \notin k[\bar{g}]$ and $\bar{g} \notin k[\bar{f}]$.

Definition 2. ([6], Definition 1) *Let $f, g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a $*$ -reduced pair with $\deg f < \deg g$. Put $p = \frac{\deg f}{\gcd(\deg f, \deg g)}$. In this situation the pair f, g is called p -reduced pair.*

Theorem 4. ([6], Theorem 2) *Let $f, g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a p -reduced pair, and let $G(x, y) \in k[x, y]$ with $\deg_y G(x, y) = pq + r, 0 \leq r < p$. Then*

$$\deg G(f, g) \geq q(p \deg g - \deg g - \deg f + \deg[f, g]) + r \deg g.$$

In the above theorem $[f, g]$ means the Poisson bracket of f and g , but for us it is only important that

$$\deg[f, g] = 2 + \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \deg \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i} \right)$$

if f, g are algebraically independent, and $\deg[f, g] = 0$ if f, g are algebraically dependent.

Notice, also, that the estimation from Theorem 4 is true even if the condition (ii) of Definition 1 is not satisfied. Indeed, if $G(x, y) = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} x^i y^j$, then, by the algebraic independence of $\bar{f}$ and $\bar{g}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \deg G(f, g) &= \max_{i,j} \deg(a_{i,j} f^i g^j) \geq \deg_y G(x, y) \cdot \deg g = \\ &= (qp + r) \deg g \geq q(p \deg g - \deg f - \deg g + \deg[f, g]) + r \deg g. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is a consequence of the fact that $\deg[f, g] \leq \deg f + \deg g$.

We will also use the following theorem.

Theorem 5. ([6], Theorem 3) *Let $F = (F_1, F_2, F_3)$ be a tame automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^3$. If $\deg F_1 + \deg F_2 + \deg F_3 > 3$ (in other words if F is not a linear automorphism), then F admits either an elementary reduction or a reduction of types I-IV (see [6] Definitions 2-4).*

Let us, also, recall that an automorphism $F = (F_1, F_2, F_3)$ admits an elementary reduction if there exists a polynomial $g \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ and a permutation σ of the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $\deg(F_{\sigma(1)} - g(F_{\sigma(2)}, F_{\sigma(3)})) < \deg F_{\sigma(1)}$.

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

Proof. By Corollary 3 if $3|d_2$ or $d_3 \in 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$, there exists a tame automorphism $F : \mathbb{C}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ such that $\text{mdeg } F = (3, d_2, d_3)$. Thus in order to prove Theorem 1 it is enough to show that if $3 \nmid d_2$ and $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$, then there is no tame

automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^3$ with multidegree $(3, d_2, d_3)$. so from now we will assume that $3 \nmid d_2$ and $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$.

Since $3 \nmid d_2$, $\gcd(3, d_2) = 1$. Then by Theorem 2, for all $k \geq (3-1)(d_2-1) = 2d_2-2$ we have $k \in 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$. Thus, since $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$, we have

$$(1) \quad d_3 < 2d_2 - 2$$

Assume that $F = (F_1, F_2, F_3)$ is an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^3$ such that $\text{mdeg } F = (3, d_2, d_3)$. Our aim is to prove that this hypothetical automorphism can not be a tame automorphism. By Theorem 5 it is enough to show that F does not admit neither reduction of types I-IV (see [6], Definitions 2-4) nor elementary reduction.

Assume that F admits a reduction of type I. Then by the definition (see [6], Definition 2) there is a permutation σ of the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\deg F_{\sigma(1)} = 2n$, $\deg F_{\sigma(2)} = ns$, where $s \geq 3$ is odd number, $2n < \deg F_{\sigma(3)} \leq ns$. Thus we have $2n = d_2$ or $2n = d_3$, and then $n \geq 2$. Since $ns \geq 6 > 3$ and $2n \geq 4 > 3$, then we obtain a contradiction.

Assume that F admits a reduction of type II. Then by the definition (see [6], Definition 3) there is a permutation σ of the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\deg F_{\sigma(1)} = 2n$, $\deg F_{\sigma(2)} = 3n$, $\frac{3}{2}n < \deg F_{\sigma(3)} \leq 2n$. Thus, as before, we have $2n = d_2$ or $2n = d_3$, and then $n \geq 2$. Since $ns \geq 6 > 3$ and $\frac{3}{2}n \geq 3$, then we obtain a contradiction.

Now assume that F admits a reduction of type III or IV. Then by the definition (see [6] Definition 4) there is a permutation σ of the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\deg F_{\sigma(1)} = 2n$, and either:

$$(2) \quad \deg F_{\sigma(2)} = 3n, \quad n < \deg F_{\sigma(3)} \leq \frac{3}{2}n$$

or

$$(3a) \quad \frac{5}{2}n < \deg F_{\sigma(2)} \leq 3n, \quad \deg F_{\sigma(3)} = \frac{3}{2}n$$

As before we have $2n = d_2$ or $2n = d_3$, and $n \geq 2$. Assume for a moment that $n > 2$. Then, since $3n, \frac{5}{2}n, \frac{3}{2}n, n+1 > 3$, then we obtain a contradiction. Thus we can assume that $n = 2$. If we assume that (2) is hold, then we obtain $d_2 = 4$ and $d_3 = 6$. Similarly, if we assume that (3a) is hold. This is a contradiction with $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$.

Now, assume that $(F_1, F_2, F_3 - g(F_1, F_2))$, where $g \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, is an elementary reduction of (F_1, F_2, F_3) . Hence we have $\deg g(F_1, F_2) = \deg F_3 = d_3$. Since $\gcd(3, d_2) = 1$, then by 4, we have

$$\deg g(F_1, F_2) \geq q(3d_2 - d_2 - 3 + \deg[F_1, F_2]) + rd_2,$$

where $\deg_y g(x, y) = 3q + r$ with $0 \leq r < 3$. Since F_1, F_2 are algebraically independent, $\deg[F_1, F_2] \geq 2$ and then $3d_2 - d_2 - 3 + \deg[F_1, F_2] \geq 2d_2 - 1$. Then by (1) follows that $q = 0$. Also by (1) we must have $r < 2$. Thus $g(x, y) = g_0(x) + g_1(x)y$. Since $3\mathbb{N} \cap (d_2 + 3\mathbb{N}) = \emptyset$, then $\deg g(F_1, F_2) \in 3\mathbb{N} \cup (d_2 + 3\mathbb{N}) \subset 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction.

Now, assume that $(F_1, F_2 - g(F_1, F_3), F_3)$, where $g \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, is an elementary reduction of (F_1, F_2, F_3) . Therefore we have $\deg g(F_1, F_3) = d_2$. Since $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$, $\gcd(3, d_3) = 1$. Then by Theorem 4 we have

$$\deg g(F_1, F_3) \geq q(3d_3 - d_3 - 3 + \deg[F_1, F_3]) + rd_3,$$

where $\deg_y g(x, y) = 3q + r$ with $0 \leq r < 3$. Since $3d_3 - d_3 - 3 + \deg[F_1, F_3] \geq 2d_3 - 1 > p_2$, then $q = 0$. Since, also, $d_3 > d_2$ (because $d_3 \geq d_2$ and $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$), then $r = 0$. Thus $g(x, y) = g(x)$, and $\deg g(F_1, F_3) = \deg g(F_1) \in 3\mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction with $3 \nmid d_2$.

Finally, assume that $(F_1 - g(F_2, F_3), F_2, F_3)$, is an elementary reduction of (F_1, F_2, F_3) . Thus we have $\deg g(F_2, F_3) = 3$. Let

$$p = \frac{d_2}{\gcd(d_2, d_3)}.$$

Since $d_3 \notin 3\mathbb{N} + d_2\mathbb{N}$, $d_2 \nmid d_3$, and then $p > 1$. By Theorem 4 we have

$$\deg g(F_2, F_3) \geq q(pd_3 - d_2 - d_3 + \deg[F_1, F_3]) + rd_3,$$

where $\deg_y g(x, y) = qp + r$ with $0 \leq r < p$. Since $d_3 > 3$, then we have $r = 0$. consider the case $p \geq 3$. In this case $pd_3 - d_2 - d_3 + \deg[F_1, F_3] \geq d_3 + \deg[F_1, F_3] > 3$. Thus we must have $q = 0$. Hence $g(x, y) = g(x)$, and $3 = \deg g(F_2, F_3) = \deg g(F_2) \in d_2\mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction with $d_2 \neq 3$ (we have assumption that $3 \nmid d_2$). Consider, now, the case $p = 2$. Since $p = 2$, we have, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d_2 = 2n$ and $d_3 = ns$, where $s \geq 3$ is odd. Since, also, $d_2 > 3$, then $n \geq 2$. This means that $d_3 - d_2 \geq 2$, and that $2d_3 - d_3 - d_2 + \deg[F_1, F_3] = d_3 - d_2 + \deg[F_1, F_3] \geq 4 > 3$. Thus, also in this case we have $q = 0$. As before this leads to a contradiction $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] H.W.E. Jung, *Über ganze birationale Transformationen der Ebene*, J. reine angew. Math. 184 (1942), 161-174.
- [2] A. Brauer, *On a problem on partitions*, Amer. J. Math. 64 (1942), 299-312,
- [3] M. Karaś, *There is no tame automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^3$ with multidegree $(3, 4, 5)$* , to appear
- [4] M. Karaś, *Tame automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^3$ with multidegree of the form (p_1, p_2, d_3)* , to appear
- [5] W. van der Kulk, *On polynomialrings in two variables*, Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde (3) 1 (1953), 33-41.
- [6] I.P. Shestakov, U.U. Umirbayev, *The Nagata automorphism is wild*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 100 (2003), 12561-12563.
- [7] I.P. Shestakov, U.U. Umirbayev, *The tame and the wild automorphisms of polynomial rings in three variables*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 17 (2004), 197-227.

MAREK KARAŚ
 INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI
 UNIwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
 UL. ŁOJASIEWICZA 6
 30-348 KRAKÓW
 POLAND
 e-mail: Marek.Karas@im.uj.edu.pl